



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,925	06/04/2001	Joseph M. Silva	12-1109	4443

32205 7590 04/20/2005  
PATTI & BRILL  
ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET  
44TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60602

EXAMINER

DEAN, RAYMOND S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/873,925

**Applicant(s)**

SILVA, JOSEPH M.

**Examiner**

Raymond S Dean

**Art Unit**

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6 - 9, 12, 14, and 16 - 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6 - 9, 12, 14, and 16 - 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6 – 7, 9, 12, 14, and 16 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeMont (US 6,351,640) in view of Beghtol et al. (US 6,253,075).

Regarding Claim 6, DeMont teaches a method for initiating a phone call, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a call initiation request, the call initiation request including a primary phone number corresponding to a first user (Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59); and requesting an authorization from a second user to initiate the call (Column 6 lines 35 – 59, the alphanumeric tags displayed to the user is the request for authorization); dialing the primary phone number upon receiving the authorization (Column 6 lines 23 – 59).

DeMont does not teach storing the primary phone number to a computer readable memory and deleting the primary phone number from the memory.

Beghtol teaches storing the primary phone number to a computer readable memory and deleting the primary phone number from the memory (Column 5 lines 61 –

65, when there is an incoming call the caller id information will be displayed and thus stored in the display memory, said caller id information will be displayed for a finite period of time and then it will be deleted from the display and thus the display memory).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the memory and method taught in Beghtol in the mobile device of DeMont for the purpose of enabling the user of said mobile device to obtain information about the origin of a call to said mobile device as taught by Beghtol.

Regarding Claim 19, DeMont teaches a method for initiating a phone call, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a call initiation request, the call initiation request including a primary phone number corresponding to a first user (Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59); requesting an authorization from a second user to initiate the call (Column 6 lines 35 – 59, the alphanumeric tags displayed to the user is the request for authorization); dialing the primary phone number upon receiving the authorization (Column 6 lines 23 – 59).

DeMont does not teach storing the primary phone number to a computer readable memory and deleting the primary phone number from the memory after a predetermined period of time.

Beghtol teaches storing the primary phone number to a computer readable memory and deleting the primary phone number from the memory after a predetermined period of time (Column 5 lines 61 – 65, when there is an incoming call the caller id information will be displayed and thus stored in the display memory, said

caller id information will be displayed for a finite period of time and then it will be deleted from the display and thus the display memory).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the memory and method taught in Beghtol in the mobile device of DeMont for the purpose of enabling the user of said mobile device to obtain information about the origin of a call to said mobile device as taught by Beghtol.

Regarding Claim 22, DeMont a method for initiating a phone call, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a call initiation request, the call initiation request including a primary phone number corresponding to a first user (Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59); requesting an authorization from a second user to initiate the call (Column 6 lines 35 – 59, the alphanumeric tags displayed to the user is the request for authorization).

DeMont does not teach storing the primary phone number to a computer readable memory and deleting the primary phone number from the memory upon receiving denial from the second user.

Beghtol teaches storing the primary phone number to a computer readable memory and deleting the primary phone number from the memory upon receiving denial from the second user (Column 5 lines 61 – 65, Column 6 lines 25 – 39, when there is an incoming call the caller id information will be displayed and thus stored in the display memory, when the user rejects the call the caller id information that is displayed will be deleted from the display and thus the display memory)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the memory and method taught in Beghtol in the mobile device of DeMont for the purpose of enabling the user of said mobile device to obtain information about the origin of a call to said mobile device as taught by Beghtol.

Regarding Claim 7, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 6. DeMont further teaches transmitting an authorization request to a wireless phone user interface (Column 6 lines 35 – 59).

Regarding Claims 9, 20, 23, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 6, 19, 22. DeMont further teaches receiving a line of sight signal, the line of sight signal including the call initiation request (Figure 2A, Column 4 lines 14 – 20, Column 6 lines 48 – 59, the fact that the beacon has a light emitting diode means that it has to be line of sight).

Regarding Claim 12, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 6. Beghtol further teaches deleting the primary phone number from the memory upon receiving a denial from the second user (Column 6 lines 25 – 39, when the user rejects the call the caller id information that is displayed will be deleted from the display and thus the display memory).

Regarding Claim 14, DeMont teaches a wireless call management system comprising a request module for transmitting outgoing call initiation requests to remote users based on local requests from a local user, the outgoing call initiation requests including a phone number corresponding to the local user (Figure 10, Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59, Column 8 lines 44 – 47, the local user is the vendor, the local

user can also be users of the mobile devices because the mobile devices can comprise beacons); an initiation module for requesting authorizations from the local user based on incoming call initiation requests including phone numbers corresponding to the remote users (Figure 10, Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59, Column 8 lines 44 – 47, a user of one of the mobile devices can receive requests from one of the other mobile devices, said requests will be displayed as alphanumeric tags), and a wireless phone user interface for generating the outgoing call initiation requests based on the local requests for initiation of phone calls (Figure 10, Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59, Column 8 lines 44 – 47), the user interface further transmitting authorization requests to the local user based on the incoming call initiation requests (Figure 10, Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59, Column 8 lines 44 – 47).

DeMont does not teach a computer readable memory for storing the phone numbers corresponding to the remote users, the initiation module further operable to store the phone numbers associated with the incoming call initiation requests in the computer readable memory and to delete the phone number from the computer readable memory at a subsequent time.

Beghtol further teaches a computer readable memory for storing the phone numbers corresponding to the remote users, storing the phone numbers associated with the incoming call in the computer readable memory and to delete the phone number from the computer readable memory at a subsequent time (Column 5 lines 61 – 65, when there is an incoming call the caller id information will be displayed and thus stored

in the display memory, said caller id information will be displayed for a finite period of time and then it will be deleted from the display and thus the display memory)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the memory and method taught in Beghtol in the mobile device of DeMont for the purpose of enabling the user of said mobile device to obtain information about the origin of a call to said mobile device as taught by Beghtol.

Regarding Claim 16, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 14. DeMont further teaches a signaling system for transmitting the outgoing call initiation requests and receiving the incoming call initiation requests (Figure 10, Column 4 Table 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 59, Column 8 lines 44 – 47).

Regarding Claim 17, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 16. DeMont further teaches wherein the signaling system transmits and receives line of sight signals (Figure 2A, Column 4 lines 14 – 20).

Regarding Claim 18, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 17. DeMont further teaches an infrared transceiver for transmitting and receiving infrared signals (Figure 2A, Column 4 lines 14 – 20).

Regarding Claims 21, 24, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 19, 22. DeMont further teaches dialing the primary phone number upon receiving the authorization (Column 6 lines 23 – 59)

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeMont (US 6,351,640) in view of Beghtol et al. (US 6,253,075 B1), as applied to Claim 6 above, and further in view of Phillips (US 2002/0173297 A1).

Regarding Claim 8, DeMont in view of Beghtol teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 6. DeMont in view of Beghtol does not teach transmitting an authorization request to a landline connection.

Phillips teaches transmitting a signal to a landline connection (Section 0013, the call can be forwarded to a landline connection at work).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the call forwarding feature taught in Phillips in the mobile phone of DeMont in view of Beghtol such that a user of said mobile phone can be reached on a land line at work or at home.

### ***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond S Dean whose telephone number is 571-272-7877. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A Maung can be reached on <sup>571-272-7882</sup>~~703-308-7745~~. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Raymond S. Dean

April 8, 2005



NAY MAUNG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER